

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.

14

**FILM-MAKING IN SOCIO-CULTURALLY SENSITIVE AREAS:
LESSONS FROM THE BO-KAAP**

by
OLIVIA ROSE-INNES

Journal Article based on the research project *Environmental Management of Filming in the City of Cape Town* by J.Kowalyk and O.Rose-Innes, in partial fulfillment of the degree of Masters of Philosophy in Environmental Science.

Article written according to the style sheet for contributors of *The South African Geographical Journal*.

Department of Environmental & Geographical Science
University of Cape Town
16 July 2001

University of Cape Town

The South African Geographical Journal

STYLESHEET FOR CONTRIBUTORS

Authors **must** adhere to the style as laid out here when preparing manuscripts for submission to the *Journal*. Failure to do so will delay refereeing and publication. Note: S.I. units must be used throughout; tables should be appended on separate sheets; a separate list of figure captions must precede the figures; and figures should be appended on separate sheets. Figures must be clear and legible for reproduction at single column width; computer graphics of high quality are only acceptable if the linework and lettering is comparable to conventional productions.

- The first page of the typescript should contain the title of the paper and the name(s) and full address(es) of the author(s) in the style shown eg:

RAINFALL AND AGRICULTURE IN THE EASTERN CAPE, 1900-1994

M.E. JAMES

Department of Environmental & Geographical Science

University of Cape Town

Rondebosch

7700 South Africa

- The second page must repeat the title of the paper, followed by an **abstract** of approximately 100-200 words in which the principal findings of the research should appear.
- The introduction (and subsequent text) must be typed in double-spacing. The introduction should not contain any subheadings. Leave a space between paragraphs. References to be cited as shown. List citations in ascending date order, and alphabetically within the same year. One or more publications by an author in the same year must be distinguished by appending letters a, b, c to the citations. Main headings should be in bold type.
- Indent and punctuate particular points as shown, and designate alphabetically. The expression *et al.* is used when the work of more than two authors of one work is being cited. Use 'n.d.' to show that a work has no publishing date. Footnoted material to be marked with a superscript.
- Type subheadings in italics, aligned with the left margin of text. Avoid placing subheadings directly after a main heading. Refer to Figures and Tables as shown. Quantities less than ten should be expressed verbally, otherwise numerically.
- Direct quotations should be cited using double inverted commas and must contain a page(s) reference. Direct quotations which are more than three lines in length should be inset from both margins and typed in single spacing without inverted commas. Avoid ending a paragraph with a long direct quotation.
- Do not introduce new material in the conclusion, and do not use point form in this section. Acknowledgements should follow immediately after the text.
- Footnotes should be kept to a minimum and must be collected numerically at the end of the typescript. Use small superscript digits to number the notes, and indent the text of the notes. Notes should be used for archival references and **not** as a device for elaborating the text or making asides.
- **The reference list is not a bibliography and must contain only material which is cited in the text. Complete information should be provided for every reference.** Organise the references alphabetically without numbering. The initials of authors and/or editors must appear behind the surname(s). Use the convention 'Anon.' to refer to unknown authors. Do not use '*et al.*' in the reference list. Date of publication must appear as in the examples. Punctuate all material exactly as shown. The only words which are capitalised in the titles of journal articles are proper nouns. The titles of journals should **not** be abbreviated. Book and periodical titles should be italicised. Volume numbers must be included for journals, but part numbers should only be used if the pagination in successive issues is not sequential. The names of book publishers and city/town of publication must be included. Monographs and dissertations/theses to be cited in the style shown. Leave a blank line between references.

References

- Anon., 1943: The roaring coastal winds, *South African Panorama*, 24 (7), 2-6.
- Barnes, J., Smith, M.L.B. and Frames, R. (eds), 1953: *Readings on Energy Potential in the Far East*, Hutchinson, London.
- Deane, R., 1993a: Wind patterns and energy, *Science*, 123, 34-49.
- Hunter, I.J., 1994: The Weather of the Agulhas Bank, Unpublished M.Sc. Dissertation, University of Natal, Durban.
- South Africa (Republic), 1976: *Annual Report of the Department of Water Affairs*, Government Printer, Pretoria.

**FILM-MAKING IN SOCIO-CULTURALLY SENSITIVE AREAS:
LESSONS FROM THE BO-KAAP**

O. ROSE-INNES

*Department of Environmental & Geographical Science
University of Cape Town
Rondebosch
7700 South Africa*

University of Cape Town

**FILM-MAKING IN SOCIO-CULTURALLY SENSITIVE AREAS:
LESSONS FROM THE BO-KAAP**
O. ROSE-INNES

*Department of Environmental & Geographical Science
University of Cape Town
Rondebosch
7700 South Africa*

ABSTRACT

The recent growth of Cape Town's film industry has brought with it financial rewards as well as real and potential negative impacts to certain locations. To relieve pressure on popular locations and distribute the economic benefits more equitably throughout the metropole, local authorities plan to encourage filming in previously disadvantaged areas. The Bo-Kaap is the only previously disadvantaged area currently popular for filming; an overview of the impacts of filming in this area could guide management of filming in other socio-culturally sensitive areas in future. The main issues around filming in the Bo-Kaap are the need for film crews to respect the area's cultural norms, and for the community to benefit from the inconvenience of hosting film shoots.

Recommendations to mitigate costs and enhance benefits of filming, according to the principles of sustainability, include formulating location-specific filming conditions; encouraging local involvement in the film industry; developing a film permitting bylaw; formalising a Professional Code of Conduct for film crews; and establishing an environmental and cultural trust fund for donations from film companies.

Film-making in socio-culturally sensitive areas: lessons from the Bo-Kaap

Introduction

That Cape Town's economy benefits significantly from the film industry is a fact often quoted in the media, and with good reason: the industry's total expenditure in the City over the past year is estimated at nearly R500 million, putting it second only to tourism in terms of income generation (Yutar, 2001). What is seldom mentioned, however, is where these financial rewards are being channelled. Many locals feel they are not benefitting from film shoots, some of which may be having negative environmental (biophysical or socio-cultural) impacts on location sites. Residents of certain commonly used sites, such as the Bo-Kaap, feel resentful that they are not being satisfactorily compensated for the inconvenience and disruption caused by film shoots. A further complaint is that areas that are currently not popular as film locations are not receiving any significant economic benefits from the boom in the industry.

Towards addressing these frustrations, Economic Development Services, City of Cape Town, aims to try to "spread the load" of future filming activities throughout the City (Ariefdien, 2001). "Creation" of new locations by promoting or upgrading less well known areas to attract film-makers would serve both to reduce the impact on popular locations, and to distribute the financial benefits of the film industry more equitably. It is deemed particularly desirable to promote previously disadvantaged areas in this manner. Langa, Mitchell's Plain, Heideveld, Bonteheuwel and Baden Powell Drive, which have all been used for film shoots, are examples of previously disadvantaged areas that could be promoted as filming sites (Ariefdien, 2001). However, there are precedents to suggest that increased filming in these areas could potentially cause resentment in local residents: for example, filming in another previously disadvantaged area, the Bo-Kaap, has at times caused resentment and even hostility from the community.

The aim of this article is to introduce the topic of filming in socio-culturally sensitive areas (with special reference to the Bo-Kaap), and make preliminary suggestions as to how this could be managed according to the tenets of sustainability.

Environmental impacts and management of filming: a new area of study

Apart from the Interim Environmental Guidelines for Filming in the Cape Metropolitan Area (Shroyer and Quick, 1998); and the Baseline Study and Situation Analysis of Environmental Management of Filming in the City of Cape Town (Kowalyk and Rose-Innes, 2001), a Masters student project commissioned earlier this year for the Cape Metropolitan Council Administration, there have been no academic studies specifically concerning the environmental impacts of filming, nor any investigations into their management. This may be because, compared with many other sectors, filming seems relatively benign in the toll it exacts on the environment. However, a number of recent reports in the popular media have highlighted questionable actions by film-makers, suggesting that investigation into this area is much overdue.

The following cases illustrate that filming indeed has the potential to cause negative environmental impacts (and ensuing public outcry):

- (a) In a commercial shot at Machu Picchu, Peru, a United States film crew used an ancient Inca sundial stone, the Intihuatana, to serve as a "drinks bar". A piece of heavy filming equipment then fell onto the stone and broke it. Peruvian archaeologist Federico Doig was quoted as saying: "Machu Picchu is the heart of our heritage and the Intihuatana is the heart of Machu Picchu. They've struck at our most sacred inheritance" (Anon, 2000).
- (b) During filming of the *The Beach* on Phi Phi Island, a Thai national park, 20th Century Fox drastically altered the extant ecosystem by bulldozing dunes, removing vegetation and planting palm trees. This sparked an outcry from environmentalists and protests when the film premiered in Thailand (De Winser, 2000).

- (c) Residents of Popotla Beach, a fishing village in Mexico near Baja Studios where *Titanic* was filmed, claim that chlorine discharge from the enormous tank used in the making of the film killed local marine life and caused a drop in fish catches (Kowalski, 1998).
- (d) A foreign beer commercial filmed last year in the predominantly Muslim Bo-Kaap by local production company Moonlighting triggered indignation in residents. Community members protested at the shoot and delayed filming, after complaining that promotion of alcohol was culturally insensitive and disrespectful towards their religion. Sheikh Shaheed Isaacs of Chiappini Street Mosque was quoted as saying: "We are a Muslim community and they know how we feel about liquor. It is a violation of our rights and of our religion" (Halim, 2000).

The important aspect these examples have in common is that they are all cases where film crews from developed countries (or circumstances) acted in a manner that seemed careless, disrespectful or exploitative of the developing areas in which they were filming, and, by association, of the rights of residents in those areas.

These examples also demonstrate how separating biophysical elements, and cases of biophysical destruction, from socio-cultural ones is often an artificial divide. A people's natural heritage is part of their cultural heritage; negative impacts to, for example, a nature reserve, are therefore often perceived as an insult to the community with whom it is associated. Nonetheless, although filming carries a number of potential environmental risks, in Cape Town at least actual biophysical impacts have been minor. The more serious impacts to date have been primarily socio-cultural (Kowalyk and Rose-Innes, 2001).

Information sources

Information for this article was sourced from literature searches (primarily of the popular media), interviews and field observations conducted during the aforementioned Baseline Study by Kowalyk and Rose-Innes. Interviews were conducted with role players involved with or affected by the film industry, with the aim of gaining a general overview of filming impacts and their

management in Cape Town. Fieldwork comprised visiting twenty-two film shoots and observing filming activities to identify their potential or actual environmental impacts.

Subsequent to the study, the findings of the Baseline Study and management recommendations made in the Situation Analysis were discussed at a stakeholder workshop. Additional interviews were held with committee members of the Schotsche Kloof Civic Association (SKCA), as one of the bodies representative of the Bo-Kaap community and which has been closely involved in the issue of filming in the area. Other interviews were held with community members affected by the film industry or involved in the local tourism industry, which has several links and similarities with the film industry. Questions posed during these subsequent interviews were aimed at gaining an informed impression of which filming impacts identified during the Baseline Study might be of particular concern for socio-culturally sensitive areas such as the Bo-Kaap, and to receive input as to community opinion on certain recommendations made in the Situation Analysis.

A further literature search was conducted for information concerning filming in socio-culturally-sensitive areas. Given the dearth of literature dealing specifically with the environmental impact and management of filming, it was considered potentially helpful to review literature dealing with impacts by similar sectors. The sector that appears to bear greatest similarity to filming in terms of some of its impacts is tourism. This article will attempt to relate insights from the literature dealing with tourism, to film-making in socio-culturally sensitive areas. (Similar comparisons could be made for film-making in biophysically sensitive areas.)

Defining "socio-culturally sensitive area"

All "hot spot" (frequently used) sites for film shoots in Cape Town are environmentally sensitive to some degree. Most outdoor film-making is potentially socio-culturally sensitive in that locals are often inconvenienced and disturbed by activities such as closed roads and noisy generators. (Kowalyk and Rose-Innes, 2001) However, areas where there are cultural or political sensitivities may be particularly sensitive to filming activities, and responsible filming requires careful prior

consideration by authorities and the film industry to avoid causing resentment or conflict. For the purposes of this article, therefore, a "socio-culturally sensitive area" is defined as one in which a residential community has specific socio-cultural concerns that might cause them to feel especially compromised or threatened by the presence of a film shoot. Such an area might have specific cultural norms or political sensitivities, or contain historically important structures that the community wishes to have respected. (Locals' concerns in other areas relate mainly to issues of access and nuisance, not cultural issues.) The only hot spot site that currently conforms to this definition of "socio-culturally sensitive" is the Bo-Kaap, although some of the other hot spots, such as Robben Island, are also socio-culturally significant.

The Bo-Kaap (also known as Schotsche Kloof or the Malay Quarter), situated on the slopes of Signal Hill above Buitengracht Street, is attractive as a filming location because of its unique, picturesque cobbled streets, colourful terraced houses and historic mosques. The area is socio-culturally sensitive on several counts: it is a previously-disadvantaged residential area with a politically sensitive history, strong religious and cultural norms as a result of its predominantly Muslim community, and contains several buildings of historical and religious importance. Its residents are descendants of slaves, political exiles and convicts forcibly removed over three centuries ago from their countries of origin, which included Malaysia, Africa, Sri Lanka, India and Indonesia. Since then they have fought colonialism, apartheid, and, most recently, the threat of gentrification, in order to live in the Bo-Kaap. (Bassier, 2001).

Minority rights vs. filming rights

The Bo-Kaap community believes it has the right to protect itself against threats to its religious and cultural integrity. Thus, the written conditions issued to film crews by the SKCA include cautions such as "no public nakedness" and "no shoots with an alcohol theme" (SKCA, 2000).

In addition to respecting the rights of local communities, however, the rights of film crews to work in public spaces must also be considered. The argument could be made that a community

cannot claim special rights (over and above those of other Cape Town residents) that involve denying film crews access to public spaces; nor should a community be able to prescribe what kind of film is made, nor how film crew members dress or behave, as long as the latter are acting within the ambit of the law.

SKCA's rejoinder to this is to claim that the Bo-Kaap Muslim community comprises a minority group, and as such is protected under the South African Constitution. This protection, according to the SKCA, should include the right to disallow, in the Bo-Kaap area, behaviours that go counter to Muslim doctrine (SKCA, 2001).

Chaskalson et al (1999) cites as the most influential definition of "minority group" that proposed by Francesco Capotorti (1991):

a [group] numerically inferior to the rest of the population of a state, in a non-dominant position, whose members - being nationals of the state - possess ethnic, religious or linguistic characteristics differing from the rest of the population and show, if only implicitly, a sense of solidarity, directed towards preserving their culture, traditions, religion or language.

According to this definition, the Bo-Kaap community qualifies as a minority on all counts (as does the larger South African Muslim community).

There are no explicit references to the rights of minority groups in the Constitution. However, Section 31(1)(a) of the Bill of Rights could be used to support the SKCA's assertion: "Persons belonging to a cultural, religious or linguistic community may not be denied the right, with other members of that community to enjoy their culture, practise their religion and use their language."

This is further strengthened by the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the primary instrument protecting the rights of persons belonging to a minority. The Covenant, to which South Africa is a signatory (Chaskalson et al, 1999), states in Article 27 (Rights of Minorities):

In those States in which ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities exist, persons belonging to such minorities shall not be denied the right, in community with the other members of their group, to enjoy their own culture, to profess and practise their own religion, or to use their own language.

In sum, there is legal basis for the Bo-Kaap community to expect to have its identity protected as a minority group. This basis might be additionally strengthened in the near future: Deputy President Jacob Zuma stated in April this year that legislation aimed at promoting and protecting the rights of minority groups should be considered by Parliament before the end of 2001. He was responding to questions in the National Assembly on delays in establishing the Commission for the Promotion and Protection of the Rights of Cultural, Religious and Linguistic Communities (Anon, 2001).

Similarities and links between filming and tourism

Filming and tourism in a socio-culturally sensitive area such as the Bo-Kaap share the following features:

- (a) Both have the potential to improve the socio-economic status of the host community; as well as the potential to cause inconvenience or disturbance to residents, and change or dilute the local culture.
- (b) Both involve an influx of predominantly white, relatively wealthy outsiders into a predominantly black, less privileged area.
- (c) Both can, as Sharpley (1999) says of tourism, bring together people from different backgrounds in a form of social interaction.
- (d) The overall level of environmental quality of the area (aspects such as litter and crime) is important for attracting both industries.
- (e) The peak season for outdoor filming in Cape Town is from October to March, which coincides with the peak summer tourism season. Many hot spot film locations are also popular tourist destinations (Kowalyk and Rose-Innes, 2001).

Given these parallels, it would seem likely that certain impacts of tourism in developing countries described in the literature would also apply to filming activities.

Potential benefits to host communities of filming in socio-culturally sensitive areas

The following section discusses some of the more important potential socio-economic benefits of filming (identified during the Baseline Study by Kowalyk and Rose-Innes and extrapolated from studies on tourism) and attempts to ascertain the extent to which these have been realised in the Bo-Kaap.

Economic benefits

The potential economic benefits of filming include:

- (a) Job creation through working in the film industry or its support industries. The film industry requires a wide range of services, most of which are outsourced to local small businesses on a contract basis.
- (b) Motivation to develop skills required to work in the film and associated industries.
- (c) Benefit to private owners paid for use of their venues or properties in film shoots.
- (d) Benefit to businesses paid compensation for custom lost to film shoots.
- (e) Donations from film companies to the community.
- (f) Contribution to local government revenues from film permit tariffs, which could be channelled back into location upgrading or community upliftment.

These economic benefits are, for the most part, not yet being felt by Bo-Kaap residents. As regards job creation, the film industry remains white-male dominated country-wide. The Black Film and Videomakers' Association (BFVA), which represents black-led film production companies, services and training associations, was quoted in 2000 as saying: "The film and television industry - which has traditionally been a white domain - remains out of reach of black people" (Masilela, 2000). The BFVA considered this to be particularly true in the Western Cape. A year later the BFVA states: "The dominant beneficiaries of Cape Town's [film industry] boom are the previously advantaged. Nothing has changed in this regard that indicates that we should be optimistic as black people" (BFVA, 2001). The outlook for job creation in support industries is

seen as equally bleak: "We have not seen any black support industries deriving support from this influx of new business. It [the film industry] is a market that is extremely difficult to break into, let alone breaking up the buddy-buddy network of support industries" (BFVA, 2001). Employment of Bo-Kaap community members in the film industry and in related sectors, has been limited: local caterers are occasionally used by film crews, and local tour guides are sometimes organised by the Bo-Kaap Museum to assist visiting documentary film-makers (Bassier, 2001).

Studies of tourism have shown that a loss of potential economic benefits often occurs if the industry is not closely linked with other local economic activities. If facilities or services are largely owned and managed from outside the area or if locals are not employed, the result can be loss of local benefits and resentment by residents (World Tourism Organisation, 1998). This problem could also be seen to apply to the film industry: companies are largely foreign-owned, employ a high percentage of foreigners and white South Africans, tend to bring their expertise and services with them to an area, and leave after a short period of time without imparting this expertise to locals in any lasting manner (Kowalyk and Rose-Innes, 2001). Also, international film cast and crew in Cape Town generally spend money on accommodation and leisure activities at top-end tourist facilities (Shroyer and Quick, 1998), outside of previously disadvantaged areas.

Compensation paid to private owners and businesses has been welcome, but limited; the SKCA reports that exploitation has occasionally occurred - for example with film crews appropriating verandahs of private homes to temporarily store equipment. In other cases, where permission was granted to film crews by private owners, the fees offered were often below the going rate. The community suspects that such actions would perhaps not have occurred in a predominantly white residential area, where daily rates for use of private homes are understood to be in the thousands of Rands. The SKCA says that, "When companies use a public area, we may ask for or a donation may be offered for community upliftment. But sometimes the amounts offered (as well as those offered for using private property) have been so small as to be almost insulting" (SKCA, 2001). However, as Moonlighting points out in defence of the film industry, locals often associate

film crews with high foreign earnings, and the average member of the public does not distinguish between foreign and local production companies, which work according to more modest budgets. Production companies complain that the public tends to believe that film companies have almost unlimited funds. The reality is that each stage and component of a production is calculated according to a precise budget, and crew members the public may encounter, such as the location manager, have to work within very strict budgetary constraints (Moonlighting, 2001).

Income generated from film permits is currently directed into central municipal coffers and is not channelled back into maintaining or upgrading film sites, or into community upliftment projects. Also, unauthorised filming, particularly stills (photographic) shoots, continues to be a problem despite ongoing spot checks by the Cape Town Film Office, and represents money lost to the City (Kowalyk and Rose-Innes, 2001).

Renewed pride and investment in local environment and cultural heritage

Tourism can encourage "greater environmental awareness and sense of cultural identity by residents when they see tourists enjoying the local environmental, historical and cultural heritage. Often residents develop a renewed sense of pride in their heritage when they realise that tourists appreciate it" (World Tourism Organisation, 1998). There is the potential for residents to experience a similar "renewed sense of pride" when they witness international enthusiasm for featuring their local environment and cultural heritage on film. As Yusuf Larney, chairman of the SKCA says: "The community already had a strong sense of pride before the influx of tourism and filming, but the interest in our culture from outsiders has reinforced that pride" (Larney, 2001).

In addition, locals could become more aware of the importance of conserving their natural and cultural heritage, and be motivated to support its revitalisation or preservation. The benefits of film-making and tourism in the area could help justify investment in conserving unique or historically important sites.

Improvement of overall environmental quality

Places that are attractive, clean and unpolluted draw more tourists (World Tourism Organisation, 1998), and are more commonly sought after as film locations. Thus the environmental quality of an area could be improved as locals are inspired to help maintain sites and the overall impression of the area by, for example, picking up litter. Residents witnessing neighbours' financially benefitting from film shoots because of attractive facades to their houses, could be encouraged to upgrade theirs. Bo-Kaap residents Shameegh Emeran and Saadick Ogier, who own brightly painted houses in demand for film shoots in Chiappini Street, say they have noticed other residents becoming interested in repainting their own homes (Emeran and Ogier, 2001).

Promotion of cross-cultural exchange and understanding

Direct contact between residents and visitors of different cultures can help dispel cultural stereotypes and allow members of each group to perceive each other as individuals (Weaver and Opperman, 2000). This appears to have occurred to some extent in the Bo-Kaap, despite the problems residents have experienced with film crews:

There has been what one could call a process of osmosis. Film crews have told us that they learnt a lot about the Bo-Kaap, and about Islam. We try to encourage interaction - introducing crews to the community, and encouraging them to try our cuisine, for example. We are also learning about the film industry and film people, and that helps us understand their needs. It is a reciprocal process. The other learning process is that, through threats to the cohesion of our community, such as gentrification (and less so filming) people learn what their rights are and that they can stand up for them and let others know what the issues are (Larney, 2001).

The process of cross-cultural exchange could be enhanced, however, by encouraging greater involvement of locals in filming activities.

Promotion of the host area

Having Cape Town locations used in local and international productions helps raise the profile of the City, and promote it and its featured areas as viable tourist destinations and venues for future filming. In this manner, tourism and film can work together in promoting an area. "Putting a place on the map" contributes to it becoming recognised as a distinct entity with a specific identity. Outsiders also become more aware of residents concerns and rights. The fact that the Bo-Kaap

has become an important tourist area and filming hot spot gives credence to the community's struggle to maintain its cohesion and identity. For example, the threat of gentrification to the Bo-Kaap's character and its importance to tourism was recently made the lead story in the Cape Times, with the suburb described as "integral to the face of Cape Town as a historic Muslim quarter" (Peer, 2001).

Potential costs to host communities of filming in socio-culturally sensitive areas

The following section examines some of the potential problems of filming in socio-culturally sensitive areas and again attempts to relate these to experiences in the Bo-Kaap.

Affronts to cultural/religious/political sensitivity

Film shoots held in outdoor public spaces are a highly visible activity. The fact that crew members are predominantly white, the profusion of costly equipment and the presence of lavishly spread catering tables are all aspects on show to the public (Kowalyk and Rose-Innes, 2001). In previously disadvantaged areas, these are the trappings of wealth and "otherness". Particularly where there are high levels of unemployment and poverty, displays of wealth may cause resentment. As Sharpley (1999) says of displays of wealth by tourists, this "may often lead to resentment amongst local communities, often if they believe that they will be unable to achieve a similar level of affluence for themselves."

Although many film crew members are local, most of the film companies operating in Cape Town are foreign-owned, and there are often foreigners and use of foreign languages on set, which contributes to the impression of what one Capetonian described as an "alien invasion" (Kowalyk and Rose-Innes, 2001). Film crew behaviour and appearance is frequently unconventional, flamboyant and different to that of residents'. The nature of filming is that activity often occurs in concentrated bursts, interspersed with long periods of seeming inactivity. To observers unfamiliar with the film industry, a film shoot between takes may not resemble a place of work. In socio-culturally sensitive areas, such behaviour can cause offence if it appears to residents to be in

flagrant disregard for the cultural norms of the area. Commercial stills shoots with scantily-clad models have on occasion caused offence to Bo-Kaap residents (SKCA). The subject-matter of the film being made can also be a point of contention, as in the case of the aforementioned beer commercial that resulted in protests in the Bo-Kaap.

A film shoot also often usurps public space and/or bars members of the public in a blatant manner from areas to which they are accustomed to have access. This may lead to additional resentment, which is likely to be particularly acute in a residential area such as the Bo-Kaap where the community feels a strong sense of ownership for public areas.

Erosion of cultural identity and sense of place

Closely related to the issue of affronts to socio-cultural sensitivity is that of the risk to cultural identity. There is a danger that a culturally unique area will start to lose its character as a result of exposure to outside influences, such as tourism and film-making. The demonstration effect, in which relatively traditional or isolated local communities exposed to outsiders begin to change their own values and behaviour, often in an attempt to emulate those of visitors, is a well-recognised social impact of tourism in developing countries (Sharpley, 1999), and could also occur in cases of ongoing exposure to film crews. This does not seem to be occurring to any significant degree in the Bo-Kaap, however, as the area possesses a very strong cultural identity, which has maintained its integrity despite continual contact with the larger society:

The character of the Bo-Kaap remains intact, in my opinion. Even with the influx of tourists and film-makers, and a few white families along with the gentrification process, the dominant culture is still overwhelmingly Cape Muslim. Having said that, we also realise that we need to move with the times, and market the Bo-Kaap as an area that welcomes tourism and film ventures, in the hope that we will eventually benefit from these (Larney, 2001).

A further risk, especially if an area starts to benefit financially from tourism or filming, is that of commodification, which occurs when locals modify their culture in accordance with market demands, and its original significance becomes eroded (Weaver and Opperman, 1999).

Interest by foreign film crews could increase the demand for locations that look "foreign"

rather than typically "Capetonian". Most filming currently taking place in the City is for foreign commercials, with locations often required to resemble foreign cities. (Kowalyk and Rose-Innes, 2001). There is also the danger that residents may start to feel as if they are living in a film set, with the effect that the original, authentic sense of place becomes diluted, and privacy becomes invaded. In the case of the Bo-Kaap, however, the attraction for film-makers is the area's extant character and appearance. The main threat at present is perceived to be gentrification, not tourism and filming:

You could start to feel like 'fish in a fishbowl' from all the cameras, and some residents complain about this, but the majority don't have this attitude. Generally, people are proud of their culture and glad others are taking an interest, but get on with their daily lives as before (Larney, 2001).

Larney also agrees that film shoots often offer residents an out-of-the-ordinary spectacle, and that film crews and tourists also undergo some scrutiny from residents.

Increased crime

Although there is little evidence to directly link increased crime with tourism growth, wherever there are significant numbers of tourists there are likely to be criminals trying to benefit illegally from their presence (Sharpley, 1999). There have been several reports of attacks on tourists in the Bo-Kaap and other previously disadvantaged areas in Cape Town, almost always when unaccompanied by an experienced tour outfit or guide (Bassier, 2001). Given the parallels with tourists, such as high visibility and relative wealth, it would seem relevant to consider whether this applies to film crews. In fact there has only been one reported incident of crime against a film crew in the Bo-Kaap, in which equipment was stolen and the SKCA was asked to appeal to the suspected perpetrators for its return (SKCA, 2001). There may be a link between criminal acts against a film crew and whether the community has consented to its presence: "A film shoot sanctioned by the community means that the community will act as its 'eyes and ears'; in essence, look out for its welfare. We have a highly effective neighbourhood watch that can be utilised for this purpose" (Larney, 2001).

Safeguarding film shoots (and tourists) from potential criminal acts is an important investment for an area that wishes to attract or continue to attract these sectors and their associated benefits. For example, film shoot bookings at Noordhoek Beach dropped by two-thirds this year because of the crime problem in the area (Bamford, 2001).

Other potential negative impacts

Other potential negative impacts identified during the baseline study, such as lack of access by residents, and noise and light pollution, have not proved to be particularly problematic in the Bo-Kaap. The issue of film shoots blocking access to business entrances and usurping parking spaces normally available for use by patrons generally only becomes acute in busy commercial areas (Kowalyk and Rose-Innes, 2001). As the Bo-Kaap is largely a residential area, negative impact on local businesses is minor. "The most popular locations for filming do not block shop fronts. On the few occasions this has occurred, businesses have been compensated" (Larney, 2001).

Noise from film shoots (and, rarely, bright arc lights) is usually only problematic if filming takes place at unusual times in residential areas, and if prior warning is insufficient. The SKCA reports that residents have experienced only minor disturbance from noise, and that problems of this nature are usually pre-empted (SKCA, 2001).

Mitigating the costs and enhancing the benefits

The following section explores potential ways in which film-making in socio-culturally sensitive areas can be managed to mitigate some of the costs and enhance the benefits to the host community. The discussion highlights recommendations made during the Situation Analysis (Kowalyk and Rose-Innes) and subsequent stakeholder workshop, and relates these to the experience and opinion of the Bo-Kaap community.

These recommendations attempt to apply certain relevant aspects of sustainable tourism to film-making in socio-culturally sensitive areas, namely:

- (a) to provide a quality experience for visitors, while improving the quality of life of the host community and protecting the quality of the environment
- (b) to ensure the continuity of the natural resources upon which it is based, and the continuity of the culture of the host community
- (c) to balance the needs of the film industry, the local community and the environment, and to emphasise mutual goals and co-operation among these.

- Adapted from Gee (Ed.), 1997

Encourage community involvement

An important general planning policy to reinforce the positive and mitigate the negative impacts of tourism is to encourage community involvement in the sector (World Tourism Organisation, 1998). This policy is equally applicable to the film industry: involvement by residents should include participation in decision-making on how film shoots should be managed, and employment of residents in film-related work. This would be important in terms of gaining local approval of the film industry through an enhanced sense of ownership, and helping ensure that benefits from the industry are shared equitably.

There is scope to encourage the involvement of local people both directly in the film industry, and indirectly in support industries. Production companies, both foreign and local, do employ locals, but (as mentioned previously) these are predominantly whites, and there are no formal training or empowerment initiatives currently in place to facilitate the entry of previously disadvantaged individuals (PDIs) into the field. (Terblanche, 2001). It may be necessary to institute special training programmes for locals. There may be a time lag before more PDIs are trained and can forge the necessary contacts to allow them to break into the film industry, however, and a more immediate method of involving locals may be in support industries. Several small businesses in

Cape Town, such as caterers and vehicle hire, have benefitted from the growth in the film industry (Terblanche, 2001).

The SKCA sees involvement by locals as one of the most effective ways for filming to benefit and be accepted by the community, and is amenable to the idea of film companies offering employment on film shoots in place of a monetary donation:

We encourage film crews to use locals as much as possible, and would like to see this pursued vigorously. For example, we recently persuaded a French film crew to use a caterer from the area, and in so doing they were also introduced to another aspect of our culture - the cuisine. We'd like to see young people having the opportunity to help out on shoots, and learn as they do so. Also, it would be an important way to introduce young people to alternative career options (SKCA, 2001).

The BFVA cites as one of the problems with employing PDIs their inability to be on sets at the odd hours often expected by the film industry, due to lack of transport from outlying residential areas: "Most shoots require people to be on set by 4 or 5 a.m. Many times people have to squat at other people's homes to be able to work on a shoot as they find it very difficult to get to a set on time" (BFVA, 2001). However, in the case of film shoots held within the community's residential area, this problem becomes irrelevant.

The film industry, communities and local authorities need to collaborate to find innovative ways to involve locals in filming. For example, "Cultural Control Officers" could be employed to monitor film crews and advise them on cultural issues in socio-culturally sensitive areas, in a similar way to how Environmental Control Officers are currently employed on shoots in sensitive natural areas.

Promote tolerance

The Baseline Study highlighted the fact that the frustration members of the public and the film industry experience in their interactions often relates to a bilateral lack of understanding and tolerance. Film crews should respect the cultural milieu in which they work; residents should appreciate a little of how the film industry functions, and how it could benefit their city and

community. There needs to be greater education of, and liaison between, both groups (Kowalyk and Rose-Innes, 2001).

Public education has in part occurred through media announcements and flyers about when shoots are occurring. Residents potentially affected by a shoot should be informed prior to filming as part of the film permit conditions. The public can also be educated through the media about filming benefits. (For example, the daily newspapers have carried many articles on the subject). Community participation in the film industry is another way to disseminate information (usually by word-of-mouth) about its activities (Kowalyk and Rose-Innes, 2001).

Also with the aim of promoting tolerance, the Cape Film Commission (CFC) has suggested that film crews new to the city participate in workshops to familiarise them with local customs and culture (Mseleko, 2001). Workshops could involve advisors and representatives from local communities (Kowalyk and Rose-Innes, 2001). Respecting cultural norms is, apart from motives of promoting tolerance, a practical measure for film crews to ensure efficiency: incurring community resentment and anger could lead to filming being delayed, as occurred with the previously mentioned Moonlighting beer commercial in the Bo-Kaap, and even prohibit future plans to film in an area. As a result of the incident, Moonlighting has been blacklisted by the SKCA as far as filming in the Bo-Kaap is concerned (SKCA, 2001).

Develop a bylaw for film permitting

One of the more serious shortcomings of the film permitting system identified during the Baseline Study was the fact that there is currently no bylaw to enforce the need for filming permits. Legally, film companies could argue (and have, on at least one occasion) that permits are not required for filming activities (Kowalyk and Rose-Innes, 2001). Unauthorised filming, particularly stills photography shoots, is particularly problematic in the City of Cape Town Administration, including in the Bo-Kaap (Calderwood, 2001).

Developing a bylaw to make film permitting enforceable, with input from all stakeholders, could help obviate some of the problems and tensions of filming in socio-culturally sensitive areas. At present, there is often vagueness about what film crews have the right to do. Such a bylaw should clearly stipulate regulations regarding adherence to permit requirements in specific locations. In the event of a dispute between a film company and residents, a permit - underpinned by a sound bylaw - could serve as a clear legal reference point.

Formalise a Code of Professional Responsibility and develop location-specific filming conditions

The abovementioned bylaw would cover the issues referred to in the Code of Professional Responsibility as contained in the CFC Business Plan. The Code, which has not yet been formally adopted by the film industry, outlines appropriate behaviour for film crews on site. Adherence to the Code, which includes points such as "Undertake not to interfere with the normal activities of the neighbourhood," and "Instruct all cast and crew members... to display courtesy to the public"(CFC, 2000), could help lessen some of the negative social impacts of film shoots.

The Code is couched in broad terms, however, and does not include any reference to the need to respect a community's socio-cultural sensitivities. Therefore, additional conditions for filming at each site need to be formulated. As suggested in the Situation Analysis (Kowalyk and Rose-Innes), workshops should be held involving film office representatives, relevant environmental and cultural authorities and residents, to develop or redefine specific conditions tailored to each film location. Conditions have already been drawn up for certain hot spots (as is the case in the Bo-Kaap).

Establish an environmental and cultural trust fund

The fact that there is currently no formal system in place for film companies to make donations has lead to these being construed as bribes in some cases. The idea of establishing an official trust fund for donations from film companies - and possibly, a percentage of the income from film permit tariffs as well - received widespread support from the majority of stakeholders (Stakeholder

Workshop, 2001). Funds would be channelled back into maintaining and upgrading locations, or be used for community projects.

The trust fund would potentially have the following benefits:

- (a) Maintained and upgraded locations would be more likely to continue to attract film companies.
- (b) Environmental initiatives and community projects already in place could be strengthened.
- (c) Film companies would be more willing to pay permitting fees knowing that a percentage of the cost were being used to enhance a resource they might use again in future.
- (d) Re-channelling funds to locations could help assuage resident hostility towards filming.

To uphold the principle of equity and ensure that the economic benefits of filming are shared, a percentage of the income from film permitting tariffs could possibly be used for city-wide initiatives (i.e. apart from filming hot spots), particularly those involved in upgrading less commonly used sites in previously disadvantaged areas. The SKCA endorsed this idea, citing Khayelitsha as a more underprivileged area they would like to see also benefit from any film company donations to the Bo-Kaap (SKCA, 2001).

Stakeholders agreed that the CFC would be the ideal body for administering the Trust Fund, and that trustees should be representative of all stakeholders, including residents of affected communities (Stakeholder Workshop, 2001).

CONCLUSION

Like tourism, film shoots have the potential to bestow significant socio-economic benefits on a host area, but may also represent a threat to residents' socio-cultural sensibilities. If the City of Cape Town goes forward with plans to encourage filming in previously disadvantaged areas, the socio-cultural sensitivities of such areas, particularly in relation to potential film shoots, need to be assessed. In this way, the resentment and conflict that filming has caused in certain cases previously, can hopefully be avoided. As each area has its own identity and socio-cultural concerns, so conditions for filming should be formulated, with input from residents, to be location-

specific. Despite the need for specificity, it can be expected that certain lessons learned from filming in one socially-culturally sensitive area may be applicable to others. In the case of the Bo-Kaap, the most pressing issues have been the need for film companies to respect the cultural norms of the area, and for the community to feel that it is benefitting financially from the inconvenience of hosting film crews - issues that are likely to be broadly applicable to most previously-disadvantaged communities.

In addition to formulating location-specific filming conditions, promising recommendations for achieving the sustainable ideals of improving the quality of life of the host community and its environment include: encouraging local involvement through employment in and management of the film industry; developing an appropriate bylaw to support permitting requirements; formalising a Professional Code of Conduct for film crews; and establishing a trust fund to maintain sites and facilitate equitable distribution of financial benefits.

Concern for residents' rights and control of film crews' behaviour, however, must not lose sight of the fact that an important element of sustainability is to provide a quality experience to film-makers and other visitors - not least to ensure their continued patronage and the associated benefits of this. The challenge is to strike the right balance between making film-makers feel welcome in an area, without compromising its socio-cultural character or the rights of its residents.

REFERENCES

Anon., 2000: Ad agency adds artefact injury to Inca insult, *London Independent*, 13 September 2000.

Anon., 2001: Laws to protect minority rights coming this year, *Legal Brief*, 5 April 2001, <http://www.legalbrief.co.za/secure/archives/Lawminority.htm>

Ariefdien, I., 2001: Manager Key Sectors, Cape Town Administration; Interim Co-ordinator for Sector Development. Personal Communication.

Bamford, H., 2001: Beach no longer safe, *The Cape Argus*, 30 March 2001.

Bassier, F., 2001: Education Officer, Bo-Kaap Museum. Personal Communication.

Black Film and Videomakers Association, 2001: Personal Communication.

Calderwood, M., 2001: Film Office Supervisor, Cape Town Film Office. Personal Communication.

Cape Film Commission, 2000: Cape Film Commission Business Plan.

Capriotti, F., 1991: *Study on the Rights of Persons Belonging to Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities*, UN Sales no E.91.XIV.2 at 7.

Chaskalson, Kentridge, Klaaren, Marcus, Spitz, Woolman, 1999: *Constitutional Law of South Africa*, Juta and Co., Cape Town.

South Africa, (Republic), 1996: *Constitution of the Republic of South Africa*, Government Gazette, Cape Town.

De Winser, N., 2000: The island hell that is The Beach, *Geographical Magazine*, January 2000, Vol. 72 Issue 1.

Emeran, S. and Saadick, O., 2001: Bo-Kaap residents whose homes are often featured on film, Personal Communication.

Halim, T., 2000: Liquor ad shoot angers Muslims. *The Cape Argus*, 14 April 2000.

Gee, C.Y. (Ed.), 1999: *International Tourism: A Global Perspective*, World Tourism Organisation, Madrid.

International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 1966, Article 27.

Kowalyk, J. and Rose-Innes, O., 2001: *Environmental Management of Filming in the City of Cape Town*. Unpublished M.Phil. Research Project, Department of Environmental and Geographical Sciences, University of Cape Town.

Kowalski, B.J., 1998: Titanic disaster, *World Press Review*, August 1998, Volume 45, Issue 8.

Larney, Y., 2001: Chairman, Schotsche Kloof Civic Association. Personal Communication.

Masilela, J., 2000: Screenwriters still racially divided, *Mail and Guardian*, 14 April 2000.

Moonlighting Film Production Company, 2001: statement made at Stakeholder Workshop: Situation Analysis of Environmental Management of Filming in the City of Cape Town, Cape Metropolitan Council, 11 May 2001.

Mseleko, P., 2001: Commissioner, Cape Film Commission. Personal Communication.

Peer, N., 2001: Tide of change threatens future of city suburb. *Cape Times*, 17 July 2001.

Schotsche Kloof Civic Association: 2000, Sample Letter: Filming Conditions.

Schotsche Kloof Civic Association: 2001. Personal Communication.

Sharpley, R., 1999: *Tourism, Tourists and Society*, ELM Publications, Cambridgeshire.

Shroyer, M and Quick, R., 1998: *Interim Environmental Guidelines For Filming in The Cape Metropolitan Area*, Cape Metropolitan Council/YEBO Environmental Services.

Terblanche, B., 2001: Marketing the key to breaking into film industry. *Big News for Small Business*. February, 2001.

Weaver, D. and Opperman, M., 2000: *Tourism Management*, John Wiley and Sons Australia, Milton.

World Tourism Organisation, 1998: *Guide for Local Authorities on Developing Sustainable Tourism*, World Tourism Organisation, Madrid.

Yutar, D., 2001: World's film cameras love Cape Town, *The Cape Argus*, 20 April 2001.